



SEMS DocID

2261400

PFE
ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-4431

10/93

Jeff Church
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
DHAC/CHB
1600 Clifton Road N.E.
Atlanta, Ga 30333
E-32

Dear Jeff;

Thank you for your comments on the Shaffer project data summary. To date I have received a total of three responses to t summary (attachment 1). As promised I have included a draft Site Review Work Plan (SRWP) attachment 2. Please review this documen and forward any comments to me by October 12, 1993. Upon receipt of comments I will make any appropriate changes and then schedule site activities (tentatively 10/18-29/93).

✓ ~~In response to your comment that the "site should be fenced restrict access" EPA is taking that under advisement.~~ The work plan is structured so that surface sample locations will help determine the perimeter of the area that requires restricted access. However, EPA is not restricting its choices of remedies fencing. Remedies (e.g. soil cover, excavation, institutional barriers, fencing, etc.) will be considered as part of any option analysis resulting from the data collected during the activities outlined in the SRWP.

Your comment that the entire site has not been sampled by a grid method is noted. While there is considerable empirical data to suggest that some areas were not used by Shaffer Electric for PCB storage or salvage (nor contaminated by these past site activities), grid sampling has been included in the SRWP.

I am including EPAs response (attached) to the comments submitted by the Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette County, Inc (Larry Rose) for your information.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Jarvela,
On-Scene Coordinator

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Region III

841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, PA 19107

(Red)
PFE ORIGINAL
7/18/90

(24)

SUBJECT: Shaffer Equipment Site

Date: JUL 18 1990

FROM: María Malavé, *María Malavé*
Site Assessment Section

TO: Ray George
Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Affairs (3EA10)

As agreed in a phone conversation yesterday, I am providing you with my comments to a letter sent by the Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette to Mrs. Kienna Smith, Senator Rockefeller's representative on July 9, 1990 concerning the Shaffer Equipment site.

As we discussed previously, the following are my comments to the above referenced letter:

- o As Mr. Rose indicated, EPA did meet on May 29, 1990 with the citizen's group as you know. During the meeting, Ben Mykijewycz, Chief of the Site Assessment Section, clearly explained the pre-remedial process. He clarified the fact that when we evaluate a site under the Superfund Program we consider the target population within a 3 mile radius of the site. However, this does not imply that EPA will sample the complete 3 mile radius area. He provided an example of this fact based on the groundwater pathway. He stated that to address ground water concerns we would normally sample wells nearby the site. This would provide EPA with information about whether there is an off-site release of contaminants.
- o During the introduction of the meeting with the citizens group, Ben also indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to provide the citizens group the opportunity to highlight to EPA those sites, not to merely choose twelve, that they were concerned about within the 3 mile radius. This will be part of an EPA discovery initiative in the area. He stated that EPA plans to conduct preliminary assessments tentatively three weeks after this meeting and sample during the second week of July 1990.

45

Mr. Rose commented about not knowing the actual date of the sampling at those sites highlighted by the citizen's group. In response, EPA did inform citizens of the tentative schedule as I mentioned in the previous statement. It is not a general policy to inform citizens of the exact dates that we are going to be on site to conduct a site inspection. We are only required to notify the owners at the properties where samples are to be taken. In addition, our contractor plans a sampling schedule at least two months in advance. In order for this sampling to have taken place in July, 1990, they had to rearrange their schedule and "fit" it in when they could. In other words, the sampling dates were not negotiable.

Pertaining to the types of samples and the sites highlighted by the citizens, EPA representatives discussed clearly the plans for this discovery effort. Upon the citizens' request for tree core sampling, you indicated that we do not have a protocol for tree core sampling. Also we presented the fact that this kind of sampling was not planned to be conducted because it was not essential for the assessment. In addition, the citizens did express concern about the apple tree area and we indicated that we would address this concern. During the recent sampling that NUS conducted, a sediment sample from the stream nearby the apple tree and a soil sample in the area were taken. The analysis of these samples will indicate if there is an off-site release due to the burning of PCB's on the Shaffer Equipment site in the past.

In response to sampling of the sediment of Minden mine No. 2, NUS indicated that it would be practically impossible to get down to the mine shaft to sample it. The mine is full of water and the shaft is at least two hundred feet deep. However, EPA did sample the process water of the WV American Water Company Minden mine intake in March, 1990 and took a confirmatory sample in May, 1990. As you know, the March sample results revealed mercury at a level of concern. However, the analysis from the resampling indicated a non detectable level of mercury (detection limit was 0.0005 mg/l). Also, the raw and process water coming of the water shaft was resampled in July, 1990. This will provide us with sufficient information about the quality of the water.

- o With respect to drilling through the pit, NUS has indicated that we would need a specific piece of equipment which we do not have at this time. Upon visiting this area, I observed that the pit was covered and therefore, there is not a direct contact threat. The main concern would be any leachates coming out of the pit. In the past, samples have been taken along the base of the pit by the Emergency Removal (ER). Also, recently ER sampled in the area to determine if there is any contamination. Sample results revealed PCB levels of 2.1 ppm which is not a level of concern.
- o Citizens also requested sampling of the building and to determine what operations were being conducted inside. The Site Assessment Section has requested NUS to plan to conduct sampling inside the building. At the present time, we are having access problems and we do not yet have a date for this assessment. However, it has been stated clearly by Bob Caron, On-Scene Coordinator, that even if the building is contaminated, it will not present an imminent health risk to the nearby population. He also inspected the building and found no equipment that might contain PCBs and determined that it has not been used recently. *It is important to note that the levels of PCBs do not present an imminent threat and*
- o In reference to the Health Assessment, I had a phone conversation on July 16, 1990 with Don Joe of ATSDR to discuss its status. In fact, Mr. Joe indicated that he would need the analysis of the samples taken at the six new sites placed in CERCLIS which have been related to the Shaffer Equipment Corporation. After he receives all of the necessary information, he will be conducting a complete Health Assessment of the area.
- o With respect to placing Minden/Rock Lick on the NPL, as you know, we would only place those sites that score above the cutoff value. It would not be possible to place the entire area on the NPL but instead, only a particular site located in that area, if it happens to score.
- o Bob Caron conducted grid samples on June 1990 at the Shaffer Equipment Site. As Mr. Rose indicated, analysis revealed several hot spots above 50 ppm. Based on these results, the Emergency Response Section will take appropriate action as stipulated in the National Contingency Plan. Although hot spots of PCBs were found on the Shaffer Equipment property this does not imply that a "gridded" three mile study from the site must be conducted. As stated above, ER will determine if further remediation should be conducted at the site.

REF
ORIGINAL

- o I would like to state clearly that EPA will be evaluating those sites highlighted by the citizen's group to determine if further action is necessary based on the analysis of samples taken in July, 1990.
- o Francesca DiCosmo, of EPA's Public Affairs Office will be providing Mr. Rose a copy of the analysis of samples taken on Shaffer Equipment site in June, 1990 by the Emergency Removal Section.

If you have any questions about the above statements, please feel free to call me at 215-597-1110.

cc: Ben Mykijewycz, Chief

Please note:

EPA or ATSDR's replies are not necessarily aimed at the specific comment heading they are paired with. I attempted to match comment with comment. You may note date discrepancies in EPA replies. (i.e. the reply is dated earlier than the comment) However, due to the nature of this site and the nature of CCSFC, issues were raised several times after the EPA already took a stand on them.

The articles were grouped by issue, and not comment. Some of the comments do not match the issues. Several of the articles had more than one issue, but no appropriate quote could be supplied.

A. SITE SECURITY

Article #: 5

Statement: "... a complete and new Health Assessment must be made of Minden in order to attain a just and [equitable] analysis."

Source: Letter on ATSDR Health Assessment **Date:** 11/6/93
To Karen-Holmes Westwood

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose, Chair

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: 6. The site is not secure.

EPA Stand: EPA is not restricting its choices of remedies to fencing. Remedies (e.g. soil cover, excavation, institutional barriers, fencing, etc.) will be considered as part of any option analysis resulting from the data collected during the activities outlined in the SWRP.

- Stephen Jarvela in letter to Jeff Church, ATSDR
Date: Sometime around 10/93

Article #: 8

Statement: "EHN [categorically] rejects the ATSDR original health assessment and the amended assessment as well."

"The fenced portion of the site is not sufficient to protect populations in Minden since contamination extended beyond the building at the Shaffer site."

" We have observed children playing in yards not 50 feet away from the Shaffer building..."

Source: Letter to CCSFC from **Date:** 10/29/93
Environmental Health Network, Inc

Individual Quoted: Linda Price King, Ex. Dir.

Organization: Environmental Health Network, Inc

Issue: 4. The fence around the site doesn't protect the people around Minden.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

Article #: 35

Statement: "Why are visitors and tourists to the area not warned of 'imminent danger' this PCB contamination poses?"

Source: Register Herald Editorial **Date:** 11/28/91

Individual Quoted: Clare Hanrahan, Citizen

Organization:

Issue: 2. There are no warning signs. Wants visitors and tourists to be warned of the danger.

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 43

Statement: "There are no safeguards to keep children and residents off the site."

Source: Charleston Gazette Date: 9/19/90

Individual Quoted: U.S. Rep. Harley Staggers

Organization: U.S. Congress

Issue: Staggers feels that EPA efforts to secure the site were unsatisfactory.

EPA Response: During a meeting with Rep. Staggers, EPA promised to secure the contaminated area, begin emergency removal operations, and conduct a full and complete investigation.

By:

Date:

Article #: 58

Statement: "There are no protective barriers around one large and two smaller pools that have about 5 feet of water."

Source: Charleston Gazette Date: July 28, 1986

Individual Quoted: Susan Williams, Staff writer

Organization: Charleston Gazette

Issue: 4. Site security needs to be improved. Students performing a health study found that anyone can walk onto the site at any time.

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 59

Statement: "The fence erected is only a two foot high snow fence. There are no visible warning signs."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to Rockefeller Date: July 10, 1986

Individual Quoted:

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: 1. Site security needs to be improved, there are no longer any warning signs of danger.

5. Site security needs to be improved. EPA's claim of 12 visits a day by local police isn't taking place.

6. Site security needs to be improved, children are playing in the sump areas. CCSFC requests a ten-

foot chain link fence be erected around the entire perimeter of the site.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 60

Statement: "Quick action must be taken to alleviate the concerns of local residents and to improve on-site security."

Source: The Charleston Gazette Date: May 30, 1986

Individual Quoted: Sen. Jay Rockefeller

Organization: U.S. Senate

Issue: On-site inspection by Rockefeller staff revealed substantial inadequacies in site security.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

B. PRIME PCB-CONTAMINATED AREAS WERE NOT ADDRESSED PROPERLY

Article #: 5

Statement: "... a complete and new Health Assessment must be made of Minden in order to attain a just and [equitable] analysis."

Source: Letter on ATSDR Health Assessment **Date:** 11/6/93
To Karen-Holmes Westwood from CCSFC

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose, Chair

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: The statement is based on the following issues:

1. The past sampling was flawed because Aroclor 1260 was used as a comparison base, rather than Aroclor 1254, which was found on-site;
7. The "pit" has not been core-sampled;
8. Minden Mine #3 has not been analyzed;

ATSDR Response: Furthermore, for health evaluation purposes ATSDR does not distinguish between aroclor 1254 and 1260 or any of the other aroclors since the toxic effects of the aroclors are essentially identical at similar concentrations.

By: ATSDR comment period review

Date: January 25 - February 23, 1993

EPA Response: Pit Sampling - The SWRP includes investigation of the "pit". The location to be sampled will be identified by local residents.

By: Steve Jarvela, letter to CCSFC

Date: October 1993

EPA Response: Mine #3: File records do not clearly identify the location of Minden Mine #3. Mine sediments were taken from the collapsed mine entrance (identified as mine #2) which is located on site. Those samples did not show any significant levels of PCBs. EPA does not intend to take additional mine sediment samples; however, the SWRP does include additional sediment samples downstream of the mine drainage which should be sufficient to indicate any potential problem from runoff from this side of the site.

By: Steve Jarvela, letter to CCSFC

Date: Sometime around October 1993

Article #: 7

Statement: "All they've cleaned-up so far is what was accidentally spilled."

Source: Gazette Daily **Date:** 10/30/93

Individual Quoted: George Burgess

Organization: Former Shaffer worker

Issue: EPA missed the main PCB dumping area.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

Article #: 8

Statement: "EHN [categorically] rejects the ATSDR original health assessment and the amended assessment as well."

"ATSDR is aware through citizens' comments and concerns that testing needs to be done at other locations in Minden where employees and community people witness[ed] dumping of chemicals."

Source: Letter to CCSFC from Date: 10/29/93

Environmental Health Network, Inc

Individual Quoted: Linda Price King, Ex. Dir.

Organization: Environmental Health Network, Inc

Issue: 1. Citizens' comments about locations of high contamination have not been addressed adequately.

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 9

Statement: Rose's group is not satisfied with the testing procedure.

Source: Register-Herald Date: 10/27/93

Individual Quoted: Dawn C. Wolfe, reporter

Organization: Register-Herald

Issue: 2. Samples should have been taken at depths in the pit area.

3. Group wanted EPA to perform 3-mile radius sampling of the site.

EPA Response: In 1990 EPA conducted off site sampling of all of the off-site locations identified by the citizens at that time. The Agency feels that it has fulfilled its commitment to sample up to three miles by sampling those locations identified by the citizens at that time. Since then, no new evidence supports the need to conduct further off-site investigation. By: Steve Jarvela

Date: Sometime around 10/93

Article #: 11

Statement: "We are requesting that a 'split-sampling' techniques be utilized, so the Concerned Citizens can take samples from the same locations the EPA samples and that the EPA pay the cost of a certified independent lab."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to S. Jarvela Date: 8/24/93

PFE ORIGINAL

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose
Organization: CCSFC
Issue: 2. EPA should hold-up agreement to sample 3-mile radius;

EPA Response: By:
Date:

Article #: 30

Statement: "We want what they promised."

Source: Fayette Tribune **Date:** 6/15/92

Individual Quoted: Teresa Swartz Roberts

Organization: Staff Writer

Issue: 2. CCSFC believe that EPA promised Sen. Rockefeller that they would do a three-mile radius grid sampling.

EPA Response: By:
Date:

Article #: 37

Statement: Rose took EPA to task for not doing a gridded study within a three-mile radius of the Shaffer site and said area residents' lives are at risk.

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 4/12/91

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose paraphrased

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: CCSFC informed EPA at the close-out meeting that they still want a 3-mile gridded sampling.

EPA Response: Gridded study would be too expensive and 1.5 mile radius study of six areas surrounding Shaffer revealed no PCB health hazard.

By: EPA reps at the close-out meeting.

Date:

Article #: 41

Statement:

Source: Letter from CCSFC to Carrie Dietzal **Date:** 11/23/90

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: This letter requests the following info from EPA:

1. All sampling results;
2. The new NPL ranking system;
3. Status of three-mile radius study;
4. Copy of plans for core-sampling the pit;
5. Minden Mine #3 sediment analysis plans;

EPA Response: EPA told CCSFC that the Agency has no plans to take additional "3-mile radius" samples.

By: EPA at regularly scheduled CCSFC meeting

Date: 12/1/90

Article #: 45

Statement: "Minden residents are accusing the Environmental Protection Agency of reneging on the agreement worked out last year by Sen. Jay Rockefeller to conduct soil samples in a three-mile radius of the Shaffer Equipment Co. plant, the site of a large PCB cleanup in 1987."

Source: The Fayette Tribune **Date:** 7/16/90

Individual Quoted: Joe Myers, Author of article

Organization: Fayette Tribune

Issue: CCSFC claims that EPA agreed to a three-mile gridded survey. They also feel that EPA is not paying attention to the citizens and are only picking and choosing where the samples will be taken.

EPA Response: Carrie Dietzal claimed that EPA never agreed to the three-mile radius grid sampling, and the agreement reached was somehow misunderstood.

By: Carrie Dietzal

Date: The same news article

EPA Response: Although hot spots of PCBs were found on the Shaffer Equipment property, this does not imply that a "gridded" three mile study from the site must be conducted.

By: Maria Malave, Site Assessment Section

Date: 7/18/90

Article #: 46

Statement: "The Concerned Citizens as well as you and the Senator believe that EPA had negotiated in bad faith; once again misleading the citizenry of a contaminated community."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to **Date:** 7/9/90
Kienna Smith, Sen. Rockefeller's Representative

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: The following issues are addressed in this letter:

1. Three-mile radius which CCSFC understood to be agreed upon was not actually agreed upon by EPA;
2. CCSFC was not notified of sampling activities prior to commencement;
3. None of the twelve "hot spots" chosen by CCSFC were sampled by EPA;

EPA Response: With respect to drilling through the pit, NUS has indicated that we would need a specific piece of equipment which we do not have at this time. The main concern would be leachates coming out of the pit. In the past, samples have been taken along the base of the pit, revealing levels of only 2.1

ppm. **By:** Maria Malave, Site Assessment Section in
letter to Ray George, Office of Congressional &
Intergovernmental Affairs
Date: 7/18/90

EPA Response: With regard to the twelve hot spots: The purpose
...was to provide the citizens group the
opportunity to highlight to EPA those sites, not
to merely choose twelve, that they were concerned
about within the 3-mile radius.

By: Ben Mykijewycz

Date: May 29, 1990 CCSFC Meeting

EPA Response: In response to the notification of sampling
activities: EPA did inform citizens of the
tentative schedule. It is not general policy to
inform citizens of the exact dates. EPA is only
required to notify the owners of the property
where samples are to be taken.

By: Maria Malave

Date: July 18, 1990

Article #: 48

Statement: "...Rose said that the citizens identified 12
areas adjacent to the Shaffer site they believe to
be contaminated with PCBs."

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 5/30/90

Individual Quoted: Dawn C. Wolfe paraphrasing Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: The CCSFC identified 12 areas where they suspect high
concentrations of PCBs.

EPA Response: EPA was to start mapping these areas as of May
30.

By:

Date:

Article #: 52

Statement: "They just cleaned up one of the secondary areas
and quit."

Source: The Charleston Gazette **Date:** April 27, 1989

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: EPA did not address the main area of contamination.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

Article #: 53

Statement: "...no core samples were taken and the community
feels that shale and Red Dog is not a sufficient
barrier to contain thousands of gallons of PCB's."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to Bob Panapeanko, EPA **Date:** 4/24/89

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose
Organization: CCSFC
Issue: EPA needs to address the area where residents and former workers claim the main PCB dump site is located.

EPA Response:

Article #: 58

Statement: "The students are also afraid EPA has overlooked an even larger contamination site."

Source: Charleston Gazette **Date:** July 28, 1986

Individual Quoted: Susan Williams, Staff writer

Organization: Charleston Gazette

Issue: 1. Interviews with former Shaffer employees have revealed that they poured large doses of PCBs directly into a hole behind the site at the drift mouth of the old Minden Mine. The students said EPA had not tested this area.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 59

Statement: "Before discussing the completion of cleanup at the site, what we believe to be the major PCB dumping area needs to be tested."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to Rockefeller **Date:** July 10, 1986

Individual Quoted:

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: 8. EPA didn't address the major dump area.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 63

Statement: "Concerned Citizens also said contaminated soil was used to reclaim a coal refuse pile in Minden near Shaffer's."

Source: Charleston Gazette **Date:** October 2, 1985

Individual Quoted: Susan Williams, Staff Writer

Organization: Charleston Gazette

Issue: EPA has missed other sites of PCB contamination, including a reclaimed coal pile. WVDEP allegedly used sediment from Arbuckle Creek to do the reclamation.

EPA Response: EPA said that was not true because tests for PCBs at the reclamation site show no trace of PCBs.

By: Bob Caron, OSC

Date: Same article

Article #: 81

PFE ORIGINAL

Statement:

Source: Fayette Tribune

Date: 2/7/85

Individual Quoted:

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: The CCSFC wants the EPA to do PCB testing throughout the plateau area to find the extent of PCB contamination via the ecosystem, flooding, vegetable gardens and water supplies.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

C. EPA DOES NOT CARE ABOUT MINDEN RESIDENTS

PFE ORIG

Article #: 1

Statement: "They think they're going to turn their backs on us like they've tried to do so many times before, but it's not going to work, it won't work until Minden is relocated and health care is provided for these people."

Source: The Charleston Gazette Date: Feb 24, 1994

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose, Chairman

Organization: Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette County (CCSFC)

Issue: 1. The group feels that the 1994 ATSDR report is just another step toward EPA closing the book on the Shaffer Site.

EPA Response: EPA has scheduled a meeting for May 1994. By:
Date:

Article #: 8

Statement: "EHN [categorically] rejects the ATSDR original health assessment and the amended assessment as well."

"However, EPA refused to recognize the area as a possible contaminated site and only took surface samples in some areas of their choice."

"Lastly, instead of picking yards that the community had knowledge of being contaminated EPA made Larry Rose pick blindly from random numbered yards."

Source: Letter to CCSFC from Date: 10/29/93
Environmental Health Network, Inc

Individual Quoted: Linda Price King, Ex. Dir.

Organization: Environmental Health Network, Inc

Issue: 5. EPA refuses to do the sampling that CCSFC wants.
6. EPA made Larry Rose pick houses to be sampled randomly.

EPA Response: By:
Date:

Article #: 9

Statement: Rose's group is not satisfied with the testing procedure.

Source: Register-Herald Date: 10/27/93

Individual Quoted: Dawn C. Wolfe, reporter

Organization: Register-Herald

Issue: 1. Group feels EPA should have paid for split sampling done in October.

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 11

Statement: "We are requesting that a 'split-sampling' techniques be utilized, so the Concerned Citizens can take samples from the same locations the EPA samples and that the EPA pay the cost of a certified independent lab."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to S. Jarvela Date: 8/24/93

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: 1. EPA should pay for split-sampling;

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 12

Statement: "Mr. Rose has requested the U.S. EPA in Washington conduct a new investigation of this site as opposed to a study by EPA's Region III office."

Source: Letter from Sen. Byrd to Robert Hickmont Date: 8/11/93
U.S. EPA Assoc. Admin. Cong. & Leg. Affairs

Individual Quoted: Senator Robert Byrd

Organization: U.S. Senate

Issue: Senator Byrd requested a report informing him of the feasibility of HQ conducting a new investigation instead of Region III.

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 13

Statement: "We formally request a new health assessment be made on the community of Minden based on a new analysis that will be fair and just."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to Date: 7/28/93
Lydia Ogden Askew, Comm. Involvement Liaison, ATSDR

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: ATSDR Public Health Assessment was inaccurate because it did not contain health data that has been collected over the past eight years.

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 14

Statement: "...say the assessment is flawed and should not be the final version."

PFE ORIGINAL

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 7/14/93
Individual Quoted:
Organization: CCSFC
Issue: The group questions how a public health study could be performed without going door-to-door to collect data about residents' health.
EPA Response: **By:**
Date:

Article #: 15
Statement: "First of all, the EPA data is fraudulent because of Bob Caron."
Source: Charleston Gazette **Date:** 6/29/93
Individual Quoted: Larry Rose
Organization: CCSFC
Issue: The group still requests a new public health test because they believe all of the data from Caron's work is fraudulent.
EPA Response: **By:**
Date:

Article #: 16
Statement: "Rose...suggested if the problem existed in an affluent section of another city the response would be different."
Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 6/29/93
Individual Quoted: Sharon K. Hambrick paraphrasing Larry Rose
Organization: CCSFC
Issue: People feel that EPA is giving them a raw deal because they are not affluent.
EPA Response: At the ATSDR Meeting, ATSDR backed-up their results.
Date: 6/28/93

Article #: 17
Statement: "I personally went to this site to bring to EPA's attention that all of the contaminated drums had not been removed."
Source: Letter to Carol Browner **Date:** 5/5/93
from Senator Jay Rockefeller
Individual Quoted: Senator Jay Rockefeller
Organization: U.S. Senate
Issue: Senator Rockefeller believes that the agency is not being forthright and responsive to citizens in the community, and EPA should better inform citizens of the Agency's actions.
EPA Response: **By:**
Date:

Article #: 18**Statement:** "The document is full of fallacies,
misrepresentations, and inaccurate conclusions."**Source:** Letter from CCSFC to ATSDR **Date:** 2/22/93**Individual Quoted:** Larry Rose**Organization:** CCSFC**Issue:** CCSFC requested a public hearing with ATSDR to discuss
the ATSDR recommendations.**EPA Response:** ATSDR held a public mtg.**By:****Date:** 6/28/93

Article #: 19**Statement:** "I respectfully urge an immediate investigation by
your Washington, D.C., office into the issues
raised by the GAO report."**Source:** Letter from Congressman Rahall **Date:** 2/8/93
to Carol Browner**Individual Quoted:** Congressman Nick J. Rahall**Organization:** U.S. Congress**Issue:** Requesting immediate review of activities reviewed by
the GAO report.**EPA Response:****By:****Date:**

Article #: 20**Statement:** "...its entire review process has been a sham."**Source:** Register-Herald **Date:** 1/14/93**Individual Quoted:** Congressman Rahall**Organization:** U.S. Congress**Issue:** Alleges that only lip-service was paid in Minden, and
the threat still exists.**EPA Response:****By:****Date:**

Article #: 21**Statement:** "It's blatant cronyism."**Source:** Charleston Gazette **Date:** 1/13/93**Individual Quoted:** Jim Zola**Organization:** Spokesman for Rep. Nick Rahall**Issue:** They feel review of Caron's work at Shaffer was not
accurate.**EPA Response:****By:****Date:**

Article #: 22

Statement: "I'm telling you that this on-site coordinator lied to the GAO."

Source: Unknown **Date:**

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: CCSFC feels that EPA did a cover-up of botched-up work at Shaffer. They feel the new OSC lied when he explained that he had no knowledge of several key points at Shaffer.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 27

Statement: "We're hoping this will give us additional information we can use to force the EPA to come back in."

Source: Fayette Tribune **Date:** 6/22/92

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: CCSFC believes that information from the Caron guilty plea will show that Shaffer was mishandled and EPA needs to do additional removal work.

EPA Response: Though the credentials of the former On-Scene Coordinator in charge of the Shaffer Removal Project have since been called into question, this in no way diminishes the adequacy of EPA's efforts to protect the public health in Minden.

By: Edwin B. Erickson, letter to Alan B.

Mollohan, House of Representatives

Date: Aug 6, 1992

Article #: 30

Statement: "Minden residents hope the federal Environmental Protection Agency will return and retest in light of new test results from a certified lab at a Virginia university."

Source: Fayette Tribune **Date:** 6/15/92

Individual Quoted: Teresa Swartz Roberts

Organization: Staff Writer

Issue: 3. CCSFC wants to take a look at the material being removed from the file due to Caron lies.

EPA Response: "Larry Rose submitted a summary of analytical data on samples he obtained from the Shaffer and Berwind properties. Initial review of the data indicates that, as stated above, some residual contamination remains. However, upon initial review it appears that the reported level of PCB contamination is not sufficient to pose risks to the community."

By: Edwin B. Erickson, letter to Alan B. Mollohan
House of Representatives
Date: 8/6/92

PPE ORIGINAL

Article #: 32

Statement: "Bob Caron stated that he and the EPA had completed their job and would not be back. We, the Concerned Citizens, say that the job is not complete and request a thorough investigation of all EPA activity associated with the Shaffer Site."

Source: Release to Senators Rockefeller, Byrd
Date: 2/19/92
Congressmen Staggers, Wise, Mollohan, Rahall and Dingell.

Individual Quoted:

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: Because Bob Caron is no longer considered trustworthy, CCSFC is demanding a review of all EPA procedures at Shaffer. CCSFC does not believe that the PCBs remaining onsite are contained or that they pose no danger.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 33

Statement: "The Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette County contend EPA did a slipshod job of removing polychlorinated biphenyls from the abandoned Shaffer Equipment Co. Site."

Source: Register-Herald
Date: 2/18/92

Individual Quoted: Dawn C. Wolfe

Organization: Staff writer

Issue: CCSFC are calling for a review of the EPA activities in Minden.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 42

Statement: A "bureaucratic logjam" threatened to delay the cleanup, but now the EPA will return to the Minden site to finish the removal of the contaminated soil.

Source: Charleston Gazette
Date: 10/30/90

Individual Quoted: Paraphrased Rep. Harley Staggers

Organization: U.S. Congress

Issue: Bureaucracy slowed-down cleanup of Minden Site. This statement was issued one day before EPA signed \$750,000 authorization.

EPA Response:
Date:

By:

Article #: 45

Statement: "Minden residents are accusing the Environmental Protection Agency of reneging on the agreement worked out last year by Sen. Jay Rockefeller to conduct soil samples in a three-mile radius of the Shaffer Equipment Co. plant, the site of a large PCB cleanup in 1987."

Source: The Fayette Tribune Date: 7/16/90

Individual Quoted: Joe Myers, Author of article

Organization: Fayette Tribune

Issue: CCSFC claims that EPA agreed to a three-mile gridded survey. They also feel that EPA is not paying attention to the citizens and are only picking and choosing where the samples will be taken.

EPA Response: Carrie Dietzal claimed that EPA never agreed to the three-mile radius grid sampling, and the agreement reached was somehow misunderstood.

By:

Date: The same news article

Article #: 49

Statement: "Along with Minden-Rock Lick residents, U.S. Sen. Jay Rockefeller and U.S. Rep. Harley Staggers Jr. have both expressed frustration at the sluggishness of the EPA's studies and have pledged their support in monitoring the situation."

Source: Register-Herald Date: 5/31/90

Individual Quoted: Author Dawn C. Wolfe

Organization: Register-Herald writer

Issue: Residents and Rockefeller and Staggers all feel EPA is moving too slowly in addressing the problem.

EPA Response: Ben Mykijewycz stressed the importance of officials taking their time to ensure accuracy and possible save the cost of an expensive cleanup of areas that may not be hazardous.

By:

Date: Same article

Article #: 54

Statement: "Unless you have money, the government don't care about you."

Source: The Philadelphia Inquirer Date: March 30, 1989

Individual Quoted: Sue Workman, Vice Chair

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: EPA is not responding to this site mainly because the ^{PFE} ORIGINAL people being affected are so poor.
EPA Response: By:
Date:

Article #: 55

Statement: "I don't know why we have to be punished, it's not our fault. You'd think the government would think more of the people than that."

Source: The Fayette Tribune **Date:** September 17, 1987

Individual Quoted: Marie Hardy, Resident

Organization: Minden residents

Issue: Residents feel that the government shouldn't have taken so long in addressing this site, and they should have bought-out the residents so they could move out of the area.

EPA Response: By:
Date:

Article #: 57

Statement: "We've heard EPA impose 'deadlines' before at Minden -- and those deadlines have almost never been met. I plan to hold EPA's feet to the fire on this latest promise."

Source: **Date:** August 21, 1987

Individual Quoted: Senator Rockefeller

Organization: U.S. Senate

Issue: EPA needs to get moving on the cleanup at Minden.

EPA Response: By:
Date:

Article #: 59

Statement: "People living within a half-mile radius of the site say they received no warnings about the PCB contamination."

"They were told at one meeting not to garden and at another that everything was safe."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to Rockefeller **Date:** July 10, 1986

Individual Quoted:

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: 3. Local residents feel they were not notified concerning contingencies for accidents during the removal, nor were they notified of the actual hazards due to the PCBs.
4. Residents are not sure whether the info given by EPA is reliable because EPA had contradicted itself in two separate public meetings. Residents

are frustrated by lack of clear safety information. CCSFC requests a clear explanation of the potential exposure and health risks associated with the PCB contamination.

EPA Response:
Date:

By:

Article #: 64

Statement: "Many Minden residents are upset because they have been written off by the Environmental Protection Agency,..."

Source: Register/Herald Date: August 24, 1985

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: Group claims that EPA doesn't care about the health of Minden residents, who fear they are suffering adverse health effects of PCBs.

EPA Response:
Date:

By:

Article #: 65

Statement: "In the suit, the six Minden citizens claim that the EPA has released some, but not all information they requested concerning tests conducted by the federal agency at the Shaffer Equipment Co. site."

Source: Register/Herald Date: August 23, 1985

Individual Quoted:

Organization:

Issue: Residents believe that Lee Thomas, the administrator of the EPA at the time of the article, was withholding requested information.

EPA Response:
Date:

By:

Article #: 75

Statement: "Rose said Saturday that he would take legal action against EPA if it does not release 'public information' this week."

Source: Register-Herald Date: 4/11/85

Individual Quoted: John Dean, Staff Writer

Organization: Register-Herald

Issue: Rose felt that information was not being provided to the public in a timely manner, and alleged that there was a cover-up in dealing with this site.

EPA Response:
Date:

By:

Article #: 86

Statement: "We demand immediate action and funding -- our community and lives are at stake!"

Source: Fayette Tribune **Date:** 1/17/85

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: The People's Justice Committee (PJC)

Issue: 1. PJC feels that EPA is moving too slowly in addressing PCB contamination.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

D. OTHER ROUTES OF EXPOSURE**Article #: 1**

Statement: "Citizens are afraid the chemicals might get into their food or water supply through gardens, livestock or game, but the registry's report says that is not likely."

Source: The Charleston Gazette **Date:** Feb 24, 1994

Individual Quoted: Robert J. Byers, Staff Writer

Organization: Charleston Gazette

Issue: 2. The group feels that significant exposure can occur through eating vegetables grown in contaminated soil.

EPA Response: Based on ATSDR's site visit, it was noted that there were no farm animals or vegetable gardens observed in the vicinity of the site and that exposure pathway was eliminated in the Pathways Analysis. The food chain can become contaminated only if it comes in contact with contaminated media (i.e. soil, water, air). Since there is no evidence of gardens in the vicinity of the site where they could come in contact with contaminated media at levels which can result in bioaccumulation, this pathway was determined to be an eliminated pathway.

By: ATSDR reply to comments received January 25 - February 23, 1993

Date:

Article #: 5

Statement: "There are gardens that lie in the direct pathway of contamination and crops grown in contaminated PCB do in fact retain and absorb levels of contamination."

Source: Letter on ATSDR Health Assessment **Date:** 11/6/93
To Karen-Holmes Westwood

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose, Chair

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: The statement is based on the following issues:

2. Vegetable crops do uptake and absorb PCBs, therefore the people whose gardens are in the direct path of the contamination are at risk;
3. Residents eat wild game probably contaminated by PCBs;
4. Tree bark samples should be analyzed for PCDFs and dioxins;

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 8

Statement: "EHN [categorically] rejects the ATSDR original health assessment and the amended assessment as well."

"Finally EPA's and ATSDR's assertion that individuals cannot absorb and bioaccumulate PCB's through fruits and vegetables is not backed up with any credible science."

"This issue of the dioxin being in the vegetation and trees is backed up with information that can be supplied by members of the community yet EPA ignored their requests for sampling."

Source: Letter to CCSFC from **Date:** 10/29/93

Environmental Health Network, Inc

Individual Quoted: Linda Price King, Ex. Dir.

Organization: Environmental Health Network, Inc

Issue: 2. Individuals can absorb and bioaccumulate PCBs through fruits and vegetables.

3. Due to PCB-oil burning, dioxin contamination can exist in the trees and vegetation.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

Article #: 9

Statement: Rose's group is not satisfied with the testing procedure.

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 10/27/93

Individual Quoted: Dawn C. Wolfe, reporter

Organization: Register-Herald

Issue: 4. Group feels tree dioxin testing should have been done.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

Article #: 11

Statement: "We are requesting that a 'split-sampling' techniques be utilized, so the Concerned Citizens can take samples from the same locations the EPA samples and that the EPA pay the cost of a certified independent lab."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to S. Jarvela **Date:** 8/24/93

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: 3. Tree core samples should be taken.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

Article #: 30

Statement: "Minden residents hope the federal Environmental Protection Agency will return and retest in light of new test results from a certified lab at a Virginia university."

Source: Fayette Tribune Date: 6/15/92

Individual Quoted: Teresa Swartz Roberts

Organization: Staff Writer

Issue: 1. CCSFC feel that results from tree bark samples surrounding Shaffer indicate that EPA should come back and retest.

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 41

Statement:

Source: Letter from CCSFC to Carrie Dietzal Date: 11/23/90

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: This letter requests the following info from EPA:
6. Tree core sampling plans;

EPA Response: By:

Date:

D. PCB MIGRATION

Article #: 5

Statement: "... a complete and new Health Assessment must be made of Minden in order to attain a just and [equitable] analysis."

Source: Letter on ATSDR Health Assessment **Date:** 11/6/93
To Karen-Holmes Westwood

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose, Chair

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: The statement is based on the following issues:
5. There is no berm containing the PCBs;

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 32

Statement: "Bob Caron stated that he and the EPA had completed their job and would not be back. We, the Concerned Citizens, say that the job is not complete and request a thorough investigation of all EPA activity associated with the Shaffer Site."

Source: Release to Senators Rockefeller, Byrd **Date:** 2/19/92
Congressmen Staggers, Wise, Mollohan, Rahall and Dingell.

Individual Quoted:

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: Because Bob Caron is no longer considered trustworthy, CCSFC is demanding a review of all EPA procedures at Shaffer. CCSFC does not believe that the PCBs remaining onsite are contained or that they pose no danger.

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 39

Statement: A citizens group known as the Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette County maintains some residents are suffering from adverse health problems possibly related to PCB exposure.

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 11/3/90

Individual Quoted: Author Dawn C. Wolfe

Organization: Register-Herald reporter

Issue: Residents believe remaining PCBs still present a health risk.

EPA Response: By:

Date:

Article #: 47

Statement: "...the old Shaffer Equipment Co. building is a PCB timebomb."

Source: The Fayette Tribune **Date:** 6/18/90

Individual Quoted: Author Joe Myers

Organization: Fayette Tribune

Issue: Residents feel that if the building ever caught fire the smoke would carry cancer-causing PCBs throughout Minden and up to Oak Hill.

EPA Response: Bob Caron said he inspected the inside of the plant and although there were various appliances and pieces of junk lying around, there were no transformers or other equipment that might contain PCBs.

By:

Date: Same article

Article #: 58

Statement: "The students are also afraid EPA has overlooked an even larger contamination site."

Source: Charleston Gazette **Date:** July 28, 1986

Individual Quoted: Susan Williams, Staff writer

Organization: Charleston Gazette

Issue: 2. Not enough testing has been done to monitor whether contamination is migrating offsite from the staged pile.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 59

Statement: "First of all, the containment structure no longer appears adequate."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to Rockefeller **Date:** July 10, 1986

Individual Quoted:

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: 2. Red oily runoff was spotted coming from the soil pile, running from the containment area to the rock filter area, through the two-foot high wall and into Arbuckle Creek. This material is believed to be contaminating Arbuckle Creek and Minden backyards. CCSFC requests more monitoring for migration, and requests that CCSFC receive copies of the monitoring data.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 61

Statement: "The citizens' group has expressed concern about what they claim are high concentrations of PCBs in

Arbuckle Creek's bed which the EPA is not including in its current cleanup effort..."

Source: The Fayette Tribune

Date: December 5, 1985

Individual Quoted:

Organization: Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette County (CCSFC)

Issue: The group feels that flooding would spread the PCBs from the sediment to throughout the Minden area; therefore, the creek bed should also be cleaned.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 62

Statement: "The concerned Citizens noted that although the water has been tested and found free of dangerous amounts of PCBs the ideal situation would be for EPA to remove the PCBs entirely from the Minden property."

Source: The Fayette Tribune

Date: 10/3/85

Individual Quoted: The author

Organization: The Fayette Tribune

Issue: CCSFC alleges that PCBs were dumped into the Minden #3 mine shaft which is the source of water for Oak Hill. The water was found to be free of PCBs.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

E. CITIZENS WANT IN-DEPTH HEALTH STUDY**Article #:** 1

Statement: "They think they're going to turn their backs on us like they've tried to do so many times before, but it's not going to work, it won't work until Minden is relocated and health care is provided for these people."

Source: The Charleston Gazette **Date:** Feb 24, 1994

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose, Chairman

Organization: Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette County (CCSFC)

Issue: 1. The group feels that the 1994 ATSDR report is just another step toward EPA closing the book on the Shaffer Site.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 5

Statement: "... a complete and new Health Assessment must be made of Minden in order to attain a just and [equitable] analysis."

Source: Letter on ATSDR Health Assessment **Date:** 11/6/93
To Karen-Holmes Westwood

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose, Chair

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: The statement is based on the following issues:

9. ATSDR should work with Dr. Hassan Amjad in order to get an accurate health survey of the residents; and
10. ATSDR should support the CCSFC in their attempt to complete a five-year health registry.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 13

Statement: "We formally request a new health assessment be made on the community of Minden based on a new analysis that will be fair and just."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to **Date:** 7/28/93
Lydia Ogden Askew, Comm. Involvement Liaison, ATSDR

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: ATSDR Public Health Assessment was inaccurate because it did not contain health data that has been collected over the past eight years.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 14**Statement:** "...say the assessment is flawed and should not be the final version."**Source:** Register-Herald **Date:** 7/14/93**Individual Quoted:****Organization:** CCSFC**Issue:** The group questions how a public health study could be performed without going door-to-door to collect data about residents' health.**EPA Response:** **By:****Date:**

Article #: 15**Statement:** "After eight years, they can't just say 'put a fence around it and everything will be all right.'"**Source:** Charleston Gazette **Date:** 6/29/93**Individual Quoted:** Larry Rose**Organization:** CCSFC**Issue:** The group still requests a new public health test.**EPA Response:** **By:****Date:**

Article #: 16**Statement:****Source:** Register-Herald **Date:** 6/29/93**Individual Quoted:****Organization:****Issue:** Dr. Hassan Amjad, local oncologist, questioned why he was not contacted although he has been involved in treating residents for the past 10 years.**EPA Response:** At the ATSDR Meeting, ATSDR backed-up their results.**Date:** 6/28/93

Article #: 18**Statement:** "The document is full of fallacies, misrepresentations, and inaccurate conclusions."**Source:** Letter from CCSFC to ATSDR **Date:** 2/22/93**Individual Quoted:** Larry Rose**Organization:** CCSFC**Issue:** CCSFC requested a public hearing with ATSDR to discuss the ATSDR recommendations.**ATSDR Response:** ATSDR has used all data available in an effort to evaluate the Shaffer Equipment Company site for any evidence of actual or

theoretical threat to public health using current science. ATSDR is an independent agency funded under CERCLA and owes no allegiance to any governmental, private, commercial, or industrial concerns. ATSDR remains committed and true to its mission to prevent or mitigate adverse human health effects and diminished quality of life resulting from exposure to hazardous substances in the environment.

By: ATSDR reply to public comments 1/25 -
2/23/93

Date: 2/93

Article #: 39

Statement: A citizens group known as the Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette County maintains some residents are suffering from adverse health problems possibly related to PCB exposure.

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 11/3/90

Individual Quoted: Author Dawn C. Wolfe

Organization: Register-Herald reporter

Issue: Residents believe remaining PCBs still present a health risk.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 44

Statement: "...there is no established standard for what a normal PCB level [in fat] is, but from his [Rose's] research he believes it is .5 parts per million. The highest [resident's] test result was .948 parts per million."

Source: The Fayette Tribune **Date:** 9/17/90

Individual Quoted: Paraphrase of Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: Results from the adipose fat tissue biopsies indicate high levels of PCBs. CCSFC feels that this indicates a need for a more in-depth health study.

ATSDR Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 50

Statement: "...the PCB contamination at the old Shaffer Equipment Co. has indeed been the root of the problem, and blood tests on at least three Minden residents have been positive for PCBs."

Source: Fayette Tribune Date: 7/24/89
 Individual Quoted: Author Dave Pollard
 Organization: Managing Editor Fayette Tribune
 Issue: CCSFC contend that the health problems in Minden are a result of the PCB contamination.
 EPA Response: EPA contends that the cancer/illness rates in Minden is not all that unusual for an old coal camp.
 By:
 Date: same article

Article #: 58
Statement: "The students are also afraid EPA has overlooked an even larger contamination site."
 Source: Charleston Gazette Date: July 28, 1986
 Individual Quoted: Susan Williams, Staff writer
 Organization: Charleston Gazette
 Issue: 3. Residents need to be better informed of the health threat they may face.
 EPA Response: By:
 Date:

Article #: 64
Statement: "Many Minden residents are upset because they have been written off by the Environmental Protection Agency,..."
 Source: Register/Herald Date: August 24, 1985
 Individual Quoted: Larry Rose
 Organization: CCSFC
 Issue: Group claims that EPA doesn't care about the health of Minden residents, who fear they are suffering adverse health effects of PCBs.
 EPA Response: By:
 Date:

Article #: 66
Statement: "Could widespread PCB contamination contribute to Fayette County's high cancer rate, one of the highest in the state and well above the national average?" "EPA claimed it had nothing to do with the community's health, only with the cleanup."
 Source: Charleston Gazette Date: August 7, 1985
 Individual Quoted: John David, Gazette writer
 Organization: Charleston Gazette
 Issue: Citizens want an independent scientific board to investigate the overall situation.
 EPA Response:
 Date:

Article #: 71

Statement: "Fayette County has the third highest rate of cancer deaths in the state and that could be traced back to PCBs."

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 5/31/85

Individual Quoted: Betty Parsons

Organization: Minden resident

Issue: Residents feel a host of health problems in the community stem from the PCB contamination at Shaffer.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

Article #: 73

Statement: "The EPA is using this area as a guinea pig."

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 5/18/85

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: CCSFC is concerned that the on-site treatment could be detrimental to the surrounding community's health.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

Article #: 85

Statement: "Rose said the committee...was shocked and concerned that no health study is planned by local, state or federal officials."

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 1/18/85

Individual Quoted: Sara Crickenberger, Staff Writer

Organization: Register-Herald

Issue: The Citizens feel that a health study needs to be performed on citizens surrounding the Shaffer site.

EPA Response: **By:**

Date:

G. CITIZENS WANT A BUYOUT

Article #: 1

Statement: "They think they're going to turn their backs on us like they've tried to do so many times before, but it's not going to work, it won't work until Minden is relocated and health care is provided for these people."

Source: The Charleston Gazette **Date:** Feb 24, 1994

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose, Chairman

Organization: Concerned Citizens to Save Fayette County (CCSFC)

Issue: 1. The group feels that the 1994 ATSDR report is just another step toward EPA closing the book on the Shaffer Site.
2. The group feels that significant exposure can occur through eating vegetables grown in contaminated soil.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 35

Statement: "I was alarmed to learn that the EPA clean-up of this area did not include the primary dumping pit adjacent to the drift mouth of Minden Mine number three which supplies the entire Plateau with 70 percent of all water."

Source: Register Herald **Date:** 11/28/91

Individual Quoted: Clare Hanrahan, Citizen

Organization:

Issue: 1. Wants justice (buyout) for the Minden residents.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 40

Statement: "It's a positive step, but this is just a patch-up situation, it's not dealing with the root of the problem. You can't truck out all of Minden."

Source: Register-Herald **Date:** 11/2/90

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: Larry Rose was commenting on the 11/90 cleanup.
Residents still want to be relocated.

EPA Response:

By:

Date:

Article #: 46

Statement: "The Concerned Citizens as well as you and the Senator believe that EPA had negotiated in bad

faith; once again misleading the citizenry of a contaminated community."

Source: Letter from CCSFC to **Date:** 7/9/90
Kienna Smith, Sen. Rockefeller's Representative

Individual Quoted: Larry Rose

Organization: CCSFC

Issue: The following issues are addressed in this letter:
4. CCSFC still demands a Minden buyout/relocation.

EPA Response: **By:**
Date:

Article #: 55

Statement: "I don't know why we have to be punished, it's not our fault. You'd think the government would think more of the people than that."

Source: The Fayette Tribune **Date:** September 17, 1987

Individual Quoted: Marie Hardy, Resident

Organization: Minden residents

Issue: Residents feel that the government shouldn't have taken so long in addressing this site, and they should have bought-out the residents so they could move out of the area.

EPA Response: **By:**
Date: